

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 35 - 37 are currently pending. Claims 2 - 34 have been voluntarily canceled without prejudice for the reintroduction of the limitations of claims 2 - 34 in one or more continuing applications. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 35 - 37 have been added. Support for the amended claim and the added claims may be found in the specification as originally filed at page 17; page 18, lines 22-23; page 19, lines 1-2; and in FIGS. 11 and 12. No new matter has been added.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 29-31, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Matthews, III (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,145) [herein Matthews].

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in further view of Goldschmidt Iki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,295,646).

Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in further view of Legrand (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,930).

Claims 17-19, 22-24, 27-28, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in further view of Steyer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,822,014).

Claims 20-21 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in further view of Steyer and Legrand.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in further view of Hassell et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0128685).

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Gagnon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,522,342).

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews in view of Steyer and Hassell.

Section 102(b) Rejection

The present invention is directed to media playback. Aspects of the present invention as recited in independent claim 1 as amended, for example, include “a system control module configured to control the driver and decoder modules to produce a first display signal for the plurality of programs, wherein the system control module, in response to receiving a user-specified program selection from the select button, is configured to control the decoder module to produce a second display signal for the plurality of scenes.”

Mathews discusses a technique for displaying a channel selection guide on a video display set. The channel selection guide provides programming information, such as television programming information, for programs that are available for viewing. The channel selection guide includes a number of tiles, wherein a selected tiles is configured to display an image associated with a program. The tile might be selected by moving a cursor onto the selected tile. The tile might be further selected by a user such that the video display set displays the program associated the selected tile. See Mathews at Col. 4, line 44 to Col. 5, line 28.

In contrast, amended claim 1 includes limitations for a system control module configured to control the production of a first display signal for a plurality of programs. If a program from the plurality of programs is selected, the system control module is configured to control the production of a second display signal for a plurality of scenes for the select program. Nowhere does Mathews describe an apparatus for producing a second display signal for a plurality of scenes that is produced from the selection of a program represented by a first display signal. The single-level display of Mathews is merely for programs. For at least this reason, Mathews fails to anticipate amended claim 1.

Further, however, amended claim 1 also includes limitations for the play back of a select program in a small frame if a scene associated with the select program is selected. Nowhere does Mathew describe the play back of a program via a scene selection, and certainly fails to describe play back of a program in a small frame. As described in the specification, for example, at page 7, lines 1 - 15 and as shown in FIG. 3, small frames are configured such that a plurality of small frames may be displayed on a display. For at least this additional reason, as

well as the reasons above, Mathews fails to anticipate amended claim 1. Therefore, amended claim 1 is patentable over Mathews.

Claim 35 includes limitations similar to those of claim 1 distinguished from Mathews above, and claim 35 is patentable over Mathews for at least the same reasons as those of claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Rodney C. LeRoy
Reg. No. 53,205

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
RCL:mmm
60302542 v1